

### REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Official Action dated October 3, 2007. Claims 7-14 have been added; as such claims 1-14 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 7, and 11 are independent claims. No new matter has been added by the new claims. Reconsideration and allowance is requested in view of the claim amendments and the following remarks.

#### Drawings

Applicant has amended the drawings as requested in the Office Action.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent No. 4,907,283 to Tanaka et al. ("Tanaka").

Tanaka discloses an optical character search device illustrated in Fig. 1. In Fig. 1, an image is provided to image memory 101, via image input unit 100 and displayed on display unit 108. Character trimming unit 102 identifies each individual character and determines the x, y corner coordinate, width, height, and degenerate code C, for each character. A user may then use keyboard 105 to perform character string searches on the data to find character sets in the display.

Claim 1 recites: *[a]n image processing apparatus for trimming out a part of image data stored in a memory and transferring the trimming image data, the image processing apparatus comprising:*

*image data reading means for reading image data from a memory; and  
controlling means for controlling the image data reading means that reads the image data from the memory,*

*wherein when a part of image data stored in the memory is trimmed, the controlling means is configured to control the image data reading means so as to read the image data for each column at a time from the memory.*

Fig. 3 of the present application illustrates an example embodiment of the present invention. The example embodiment includes a processing circuit 41 that uses DMA

controlling circuit 40 to pass commands to a plurality of memories (13, 22, 32) via a plurality of DMA devices (10, 20, 30) and associated Busses (11, 21, 31). The processing circuit is able to directly receive data via the plurality of DMA devices (10, 20, 30) and busses (11, 21, 31). The DMA controller 40 acts as a gateway to the various memories (13, 22, 32). To access a trimmed image, the processor circuit 41 issues a command to DMA controller 41 indicating the location of the trimmed image within the original image. In response, the DMA controller 40 issues a series of DMA commands to DMAs (10, 20, 30) to retrieve only the desired portion of the original image one pixel/data column at a time, without including any undesired portion of the original image.

With respect to claim 1, Tanaka fails to teach or suggest *“when a part of image data stored in the memory is trimmed, the controlling means is configured to control the image data reading means so as to read the image data for each column at a time from the memory.”*

Page 3 of the Office Action rejects this portion of claim 1 by referring to the image data in Image Memory 101, and later by citing to the image data in the Character Information Table 103.

First, Tanaka does not disclose how the image data in the image memory is read. Tanaka only discloses that the image data is trimmed and used to create heuristic image character data (i.e., the x-y corner, width, height, degenerate code) stored as a table. While Tanaka discloses that abstract data is stored in a table, Tanaka does not disclose how the data is written or read from memory.

Second, the Office Action confuses the term “image data” in the claims. In setting forth the rejection, the Office Action refers to “image data” as the image in the image memory 101, and then refers to “image data” as the character heuristics in the information table. However, when reciting the terms “an image data” and “the image data,” claim 1 is clearly referring to the same “image data” element. Therefore, the rejection set forth on Page 3, which uses two different data sets in Tanaka to reject the same “image data” in claim 1, confuses and incorrectly rejects the “image data” recited in claim 1 on two different pieces of data. As such, the rejection incorrectly rejects the single image data in the claims on two different types of data in Tanaka.

Accordingly, Tanaka fails teach or suggest various features of claim 1. For similar reasons, Tanaka also fails to teach various features of claim 5. Furthermore, at least for the reason disclosed above, claims 2-4 and 6 overcome Tanaka because they depend on independent claims 1 and 5.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SON-2842 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

Christopher M. Tobin

Registration No.: 40,290

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorneys for Applicant